REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-34 remain pending in the application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)

Claims 1-10, 21-28 and 31-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ebrahim (European Patent Application 0817444A2). Independent claim 1, from which all other pending claims depend, includes the following:

> "determining, according to an information object repository selection procedure, which of a number of information object repositories should service the request for the information object without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository selected according to the selection procedure." (Applicant's claim 1; Emphasis added)

Ebrahim discloses a system for context-dependent name resolution. In particular, Ebrahim states:

> "Name resolution can include any kind of name resolution lookup for binding one object to another. This includes binding the name of a service to a host computer (or its IP address) that provides that service, and binding the type of service to the name of a service providing that type of service." (Ebrahim, Col. 3, Lines 47-53; Emphasis added.)

In accordance with Ebrahim, a request for a particular service or domain is directed to an IP address of a host that can provide the requested service.

The assertion in the Office Action that Ebrahim, Col. 6, lines 18-22 teaches the appropriate recipient is selected based on criteria or context of the request and not necessarily on the service requested, is incorrect. The referred lines merely describe a context-dependent name resolution system. On the contrary, the reference teaches that the service requested taken into consideration. Col. 6, lines 21-29 state that:

"For instance, in the example of FIG. 6 the resolution of the destination address to sun.com (Europe) could be modified if the load of sun.com (Europe) is larger by some predetermined threshold amount than the load at sun.com (USA)--in which case the sun.com (USA) resolution could override the default sun.com (Europe) resolution for requesters in Europe, either at all times or only during peak European hours, which correspond to off-peak hours in the United States." (Col. 6, lines 21-29)

Cleary, in this example, the request is directed to an IP address of a host that can provide the specific service. In this case the host is a WWW server for Sun Microsystems Inc (Col. 5, lines 4-5). Both sun.com (USA) and sun.com (Europe) are WWW servers that contain the object which is the subject of the request. The load of the sun.com is simply the context criteria used to select which of the WWW servers to provide the service. Therefore, the referred lines do not support the assertion made.

Further, the Office Action states that Ebrahim, Col. 5, lines 6-16 teaches name resolution can include any type of name resolution lookup binding one object to another; a request's "name" resolution and the binding to object is determined not by the particular service or domain requested but according to other criteria which do not take into regard whether the information requested is actually stored at the destination. This assertion is incorrect. In contrast, these lines describe that the name "www.sun.com" binds to two WWW servers located in USA and Europe respectively. Either of the WWW servers contain the object which is the subject of the user's request to access "www.sun.com". The requestor's location is used to route the request to the appropriate WWW server.

The Office Action states that Ebrahim, Col.8, lines 30-53 teaches the DNS name resolution may be a distinct operation from the service location, therefore server selection based on DNS name resolution does not take into regard the requested service thus requiring a combination of considerations of the multiple binding feature. This assertion is incorrect. The referred lines cited claims 4-7, which are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1. Claim 1 reads:

"A system for name resolution comprising:

a first service provider;

a first requester configured to generate a request which indicates a destination name of a service; and

a name resolver interposed between said first service provider and said first requester, wherein said name resolver is configured to select a destination address corresponding to said destination name of said service from a plurality of destination addresses depending upon at least two of either a geographical location of said first requester, a load of use of said first provider, and/or a time of said request, wherein said geographic location of said first requester is specified as a parameter within said request. (Ebrahim, claim 1; Emphasis added.)"

Claim 1 of Ebrahim clearly describes the "name resolver is configured to select a destination address corresponding to said destination name of said service". Thus the referred lines do not support the assertion made.

In addition, the Office Action states that Ebrahim, Col. 7 lines 30-39 teaches a context-based name resolution that does not have to take into consideration whether the requested information object is actually stored at the selected destination but instead considers the context in which the request for the information is received. This is incorrect as these lines merely teach that "variations may be had by designating a given name resolution as a default resolution, and utilizing alternative resolutions only upon the request meeting predetermined criteria (Col.7, lines 29-33). " There is no teaching that the requested information object is not stored at the selected destination. The alternative resolutions may still route the request to a destination that contains the object that is the subject of the request.

In conclusion, Ebrahim clearly does not disclose the claimed invention wherein addresses of information object repositories that should service a request are provided "without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository selected according to a selection procedure." This is a fundamental distinction from the system described by Ebrahim and, accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over this reference.

Claims 2-10, 21-28, and 31-34, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, are likewise not anticipated by Ebrahim. For at least the foregoing reasons, the present rejections should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(A)

Claims 11-15 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ebrahim in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,205,477). Johnson discloses a method and apparatus for distributing server requests among a plurality of servers in a distributed system. However, neither Johnson nor Ebrahim discloses determining which of a number of information object repositories should service a request for an information object <u>without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository selected according to a selection procedure</u>. Consequently, claims 11-15 and 29-30 are not obvious over the combination of Ebrahim and Johnson.

Similarly, claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ebrahim in view of Chauhan (European Patent Application 0959601). Chauhan discloses a system and method for providing server selection for mirrored sites. However, neither Chauhan nor Ebrahim discloses determining which of a number of information object repositories should service a request for an information object <u>without regard as to whether the information object is actually stored at the information object repository selected according to a selection procedure</u>. Consequently, claims 16-20 are not obvious over the combination of Ebrahim and Johnson.

CONCLUSION

In view of all the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Jaina Chua at (408) 947-8200 ext. 213.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: February 25, 2004

Chze Koon Chua
Reg. No. 53,831

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200

I:\Cenus Technologies\005543.P002\5543P002_ROA_as_filed_2_25_04.doc